

## **Approval Process Overview and Oversight**

Robert A. Yetter, PhD
Associate Director, Review Management



- **BIOLOGICS**
- DEVICES
- DRUGS
- HUMAN TISSUE INTENDED FOR TRANSPLANTATION



### BIOLOGICS

- Investigational New Drug Exemptions (IND, 21 CFR 312)
- Biologics License Applications (BLA, 21 CFR 600-680)

#### EXAMPLES

- Vaccines and allergenics
- Blood Products (including blood grouping reagents and donor screening tests for bloodborne pathogens)
- Therapeutics (monoclonal antibodies, cytokines, cellular & gene therapies, xenotransplantation)



#### MEDICAL DEVICES

- Investigational Device Exemptions (IDE, 21 CFR 812)
- Premarket Approval Applications (PMA, 21 CFR 814)
  - Product Development Protocol (PDP, 21 CFR 814.19)
  - Humanitarian Device Exemption (HDE, 21 CFR 814 Subpart H)
- Premarket Notifications (510(k), 21 CFR 807 Subpart E)

#### EXAMPLES

- Blood Collecting and Processing Devices
- Donor blood compatibility tests, bloodborne pathogen tests and associated testing instruments
- Blood establishment computer software



#### DRUGS

- Investigational New Drug Exemptions (IND, 21 CFR 312)
- New Drug Applications (NDA, 21 CFR 314)
- Abbreviated New Drug Applications (ANDA, 21 CFR 314 Subpart C)

#### EXAMPLES

- Blood Collection Bags (anticoagulants)
- Thrombolytics (clot busters)
- Blood preservatives



- HUMAN TISSUE INTENDED FOR TRANSPLANTATION
  - Human Tissue Intended for Transplantation (21 CFR 1270)
- EXAMPLES
  - Bone, Skin, Corneas, Ligaments, Tendons



## OVERVIEW OF THE APPROVAL PROCESS

- CBER's PREDOMINANT APPROVAL PATHWAY IS THE IND/BLA
  - Most submissions are IND/BLA related
  - Many principles of the IND/BLA pathway are found in the other approval pathways
- OTHER PATHWAYS USE THE SPECIFIC PATHWAY REGULATIONS/GUIDANCE
  - Device and drug reviews are conducted using device and drug regulations and guidances respectively

### LICENSES

21 CFR 601.2

**One License:** 

- Biologic License
  - Product & Establishment Licenses are now obsolete

21 CFR 601.2c

Biologics License for Specified Products



### PRESCRIPTION DRUG USER FEE ACT (PDUFA)

- Performance goals
  - Clinical Hold Responses
  - Review and Act On
- Management goals
  - Discipline Reviews
  - Two Level Resubmissions Class 1 and 2
  - Meeting Management



### **Managed Review Process**

- Developed to facilitate meeting PDUFA requirements
- Standardized the review process
  - Goal dates
  - Target dates
- Helped standardize review expectations
  - Content
  - Documentation



### IND PHASE

- Pre-IND meeting
  - CBER SOPP 8101.1 Scheduling and Conduct of Regulatory Review Meetings with Sponsors and Applicants
- Identify potential review committee
- Consider Advisory Committee needs & schedule
- Arrange for BiMo Inspection



### THE REVIEW COMMUNEE

# CONSTITUTED TO CONTAIN THE NECESSARY EXPERTISE TO REVIEW THE SUBMISSION



## RESPONSIBILITIES CHAIRPERSON/LEAD

- CONSTITUTE the committee
- ASSIGN sections for review
- SCHEDULE and CONDUCT meetings
- WRITE "action" letters
- PRESENT at Advisory Committee Meetings
- REQUEST a pre-license inspection
- PREPARE a Summary of Basis for Approval (SBA)



### RESPONSIBILITIES

### REGULATORY PROJECT MANAGER

- MANAGE the review of the application
- REVIEW assigned portions of application
- PERFORM quality control check on the review
- ASSURE reviews are documented properly
- ASSURE review of labeling is complete
- COORDINATE compliance status check
- PREPARE approval letter for new products
- PREPARE finding of no significant impact



### RESPONSIBILITIES

#### **DISCIPLINE REVIEWER**

- REVIEW assigned sections of the application
- WRITE an annotated review memo
- ATTEND review committee meetings
- COMMUNICATE with the applicant as necessary and document the discussion
- PREPARE for Advisory Committee meetings
- PARTICIPATE in the pre-approval inspection (if necessary)
- CONSIDER if a public health and/or research questions need to be answered relative to product approval

### WHO SUBMITS?

### **MANUFACTURER**

 Any legal person or entity who is engaged in manufacture

or

 An applicant for a license who takes responsibility for compliance with product and establishment standards



### WHAT DO THEY SUBMIT?

- Biologics License Application (BLA)
- Supplements & Annual Reports



## BIOLOGICS LICENSE APPLICATION

### **Submitted on FDA 356h**

- Source material / raw materials
- Manufacturing information
- Pre-clinical studies
- Clinical studies
- Labeling



### **BIOLOGICS LICENSE APPLICATION**

### **Submitted on FDA 356h**

- Name, address & phone number of manufacturer
- Name & address of facilities
- Authorized official
- Facility information
- Utilities information
- Contamination/cross-contamination information
- Environmental assessment or categorical exclusion.

### **International Harmonization**

### Using the CTD

- An agreed upon common format for the modular presentation of summaries, reports and data
- Content is harmonized to the extent of relevant ICH guidelines
- 5 modules:
  - 1. Regional Specific Information
  - 2. Quality Overall Summary
  - 3. Quality
  - 4. Non-clinical Study Reports
  - **5.** Clinical Study Reports



### **Electronic Submissions**

- Submission of BLA/S may be made on paper or electronically
- Submissions should be made in accordance with published guidance:
  - http://www.fda.gov/cber/esub/esub.htm



### APPLICATION RECEIVED

- Administrative processing
  - Submission tracking number assigned (STN)
  - data entry
  - user fee verification
- First committee meeting
  - review assignments
  - time frames



## SUBMISSION TRACKING NUMBER aaaaaa.bbbb/cccc



### FILING REVIEW

- Review for completeness
  - RTF policy
  - CBER SOPP 8404 Refusal to File Guidance for Product License Applications and Establishment License Applications
- Filing meeting
- Filing letter
- Notify applicant of any deficiencies identified during filing review



### REFUSE TO FILE

A refusal to file (RTF) letter is issued when the submission has been deemed not sufficiently complete for a meaningful review

21 CFR601.2(a), RTF Policy, SOPP 8404



### COMPLETE REVIEW

- Substantive review
  - Information requests
  - Review memos
  - Discipline reviews
  - labeling
  - lot release protocols
- Inspections
  - Facility
  - Bioresearch Monitoring
- Advisory Committee presentation



### REVIEW MEMO

- Typed, Signed and Dated
- What was reviewed
  - Which application?
  - Which sections?
- Comments and questions
  - Annotated (page and line numbers)
  - Questions are prepared for incorporation into a Discipline Review or Complete Response letter



## INFORMATION REQUESTS (IRs)

- Issued while the review is in progress
- Requests information needed to continue the review
- IRs may be made by letter, telephone or FAX
- IRs are documented in the file
- The response to an information request should not be so great as to constitute a major amendment
- Responses to information requests do not necessarily have to be reviewed in the current review cycle
- DOES NOT STOP THE REVIEW CLOCK



### DISCIPLINE REVIEWS (DRs)

- A DR letter is issued when a particular discipline (clinical, CMC, etc.) has finished its review, but the complete review is not yet done
- A DR letter contains comments and questions that might appear in the action letter
- Responses to DR letters need not necessarily be reviewed prior to issuance of the action letter
- DOES NOT STOP THE REVIEW CLOCK



### ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD

Copies of Telecons, FAXes, Review Memos, Meeting Minutes, etc., become part of the administrative record and are entered into the file and the tracking system



### **ACTION DECISION**

- After a complete review is finished
  - Inspections
  - Advisory Committee
- Review Committee meeting
  - Outstanding issues
  - Agreements & commitments
- License action recommendation
  - Not ready for approval
  - Approval



## Scientific Dispute Resolution Within the Team (Internal)

- There may be a scientific dispute within the team during the course of the review
- SOPP 8006, Resolution of Differences in Scientific Judgment in the Review Process
  - Appeals are made up through the chain of command until resolution is reached
  - May be referred to a Center Coordinating Committee



## ACTION Not Ready for Approval

### COMPLETE RESPONSE LETTER

- Itemizes all deficiencies in the application that must be corrected prior to approval
- Stops the review clock

### RESUBMISSION

- Class 1 or 2
- Restarts the clock



### **PDUFA Resubmissions**

- Guidance for Industry: Classifying Resubmissions in Response to Action Letters, May 14, 1998
- SOPP 8405.1 Procedures for the Classification of Resubmissions of an Application for a Product Covered by PDUFA (5/20/98)
- Performance Goals
  - Class 1 resubmission 90% in 2 months
  - Class 2 resubmission 90% in 6 months



### **External Dispute Resolution**

- Guidance for Industry: Formal Dispute Resolution: Appeals Above the Division Level
- SOPP 8005 Major Dispute Resolution Process
  - Disputes that cannot be resolved at the division level
  - Under PDUFA, timelines are provided, e.g., act on 90% within 30 days



## ACTION Approval

- Compliance check
- Summary of Basis for Approval (SBA)
- Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) or confirm categorical exclusion
- Approval letter
  - Grants permission to distribute
  - Itemizes all agreements & commitments
- Issue license



## **Review Oversight**

- Routine review oversight
  - Branch Chief
  - Division Director
  - Office/Center Director
- Dispute Resolution
  - Internal SOPP 8006
  - External SOPP 8005
- Quality Assurance
  - Clinical Hold Oversight Committee
  - Refusal to File Oversight Committee



## First Level of Review Oversight

#### Branch/Lab Chief

 Branch/Lab Chief concurrence/non-concurrence of a discipline reviewer's comments and recommendation

#### Based on

- Current scientific knowledge base of the proposed product
- Ongoing research in that product's area, I.e., peer reviewed journals, scientific meetings, CBER research, etc.

#### - Factoring in

- PHS and FD&C Acts as appropriate
- Applicable regulations
- Applicable guidances
- Applicable CBER Standard Operating Procedures and Policies



## Second Level of Review Oversight

### Division Director

- Division Director concurrence/non-concurrence of all discipline reviews and recommendations from the review team and weighs an approval or deficiency action
  - Based on
    - Current scientific knowledge base of the proposed product
    - Ongoing research in that product's area, I.e., peer reviewed journals, scientific meetings, CBER research, etc.
  - Factoring in
    - PHS and FD&C Acts as appropriate
    - Applicable regulations
    - Applicable guidances
    - Applicable CBER Standard Operating Based on



## Third Level of Review Oversight

### (Usually for New or Unique Products)

#### Office/Center Director

- Office/Center Director concurrence/non-concurrence of all discipline reviews and recommendations of the review team and weighs an approval or deficiency action recommended by the Division Director
  - Based on
    - Current scientific knowledge base of the proposed product
    - Ongoing research in that product's area, I.e., peer reviewed journals, scientific meetings, CBER research, etc.
  - Factoring in
    - PHS and FD&C Acts as appropriate
    - Applicable regulations
    - Applicable guidances
    - Applicable CBER Standard Operating Based on



## **CBER Management Oversight**

- SOPP for Major Dispute Resolution
- Clinical Hold Oversight
- Refusal to File Oversight



## **CBER Management Oversight: QA**

- Clinical Hold Oversight Committee
  - Composed of representatives from
    - CBER Management (Review Management, Policy, QA, Deputy Director for Medicine and Center Director)
    - Product Offices (OBRR, OVRR, OTRR, OCBQ)
    - Center for Drugs (Office of Medical Products)
  - Review team presents a summary highlighting the reason for the Clinical Hold
  - IND/IDE Sponsor is invited to present their point of view
  - Evaluates the quality of the review process



## **CBER Management Oversight: QA**

- Refuse to File Oversight Committee
  - Composed of representatives from
    - CBER Management (Review Management, Policy, QA, Deputy Director for Medicine, Center Director)
    - Product Offices (OBRR, OVRR, OTRR, OCBQ)
    - Center for Drugs (Office of Medical Products)
  - Review team presents a summary highlighting the reason for the refusal to file
  - The Applicant is invited to present their point of view
  - Evaluates the quality of the review process



# MANUAL OF STANDARD OPERATING PROCEDURES AND POLICIES

**Table of Contents** 

http://www.cber.fda.gov/sopp/toc.htm

